

December 2018

VITA

WILLIAM C. THOMPSON

Department of Criminology, Law & Society
University of California
Irvine, California 92697
(949) 824-6156
Email: william.thompson@uci.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D.	1984	Stanford University (Psychology) Dissertation Topic: Bayesian and intuitive assessment of forensic science evidence in criminal trials.
J.D.	1982	Boalt Hall School of Law, University of California, Berkeley
B.A.	1976	University of Southern California (Psychology)

POSITIONS

2018-present	Professor Emeritus, University of California, Irvine
1995-2017	Professor, University of California, Irvine Department of Criminology, Law & Society (primary appointment)
2010-2017 2000-2017	School of Law (affiliated faculty member); Department of Psychology & Social Behavior (joint appointment)
August-Nov 2016	Simons Foundation Fellow Programme on Probability and Statistics in Forensic Science Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences Cambridge University, Cambridge UK.
July 1, 2006- June 30, 2009	Chair, Department of Criminology, Law & Society, University of California, Irvine
1989-1995	Associate Professor, Program in Social Ecology and Department of Criminology, Law & Society University of California, Irvine
1983-1989	Assistant Professor, Program in Social Ecology, University of California, Irvine
1982-1983	Associate Attorney. Clark Deichler, LLC. Oakland, California.
1981	Staff Fellow. President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research, Washington, D.C.

PUBLICATIONS

Scientific Reports

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Forensic Science Assessments: A Quality and Gap Analysis- Latent Fingerprint Examination, (Report prepared by William Thompson, John Black, Anil Jain, and Joseph Kadane), September 2017. DOI: 10.1126/srhlr.aag2874

Articles in law reviews and peer-reviewed scholarly journals

Thompson, W.C. & Scurich, N. How cross-examination on subjectivity and bias affects jurors' evaluations of forensic science evidence. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2019. doi: 10.1111/1556-4029.14031. Available online at: onlinelibrary.wiley.com

Thompson, W.C. (2018). How should forensic scientists present source conclusions? *Seton Hall Law Review*, 48(3): 774-813.
<http://scholarship.shu.edu/shlr/vol48/iss3/9>

Thompson, W.C., Vuille, J., Taroni, F., & Biedermann, A. (2018). After Uniqueness: The Evolution of Forensic Science Opinion. *Judicature*.102(1): 18-27.

Thompson, W.C., Grady, R.H., Lai, E. & Stern, H. (2018). Perceived strength of forensic scientists' reporting statements about source conclusions. *Law, Probability & Risk*, 17(2): 133-155. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lpr/mgy012>

Thompson, W.C., Scurich, N., Dioso-Villa, R., & Velazquez, B. (2017). Evaluating negative forensic evidence: When do jurors treat absence of evidence as evidence of absence? *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 14(3): 569-591.

Morrison, G.S. & Thompson, W.C. (2017). Assessing the admissibility of a new generation of forensic voice comparison testimony. *Columbia Science & Technology Law Review*, 18: 326-433.
<http://www.stlr.org/download/volumes/volume18/morrisonThompson.pdf>

Vuille, J. and Thompson, W.C. (2016). An American Advantage? How American and Swiss Criminal Defense Attorneys Evaluate Forensic DNA Evidence. *International Commentary on Evidence*, 14: 1-42.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ice-2016-0002>

Saks, M.J., Albright, T., Bohan, T.L., Bierer, B.E., Bowers, C.M., Bush, M.A., Bush, P.J., Casadevall, A., Cole, S.A., Denton, M.B., Diamond, S.S., Dioso-Villa, R., Epstein, J., Faigman, D., Faigman, L., Fienberg, S.E., Garrett, B.L., Giannelli, P.C., Greely, H.T., Imwinkelried, E., Jamieson, A., Kafadar, K., Kassirer, J.P., Koehler, J.J., Korn, D., Mnookin, J., Morrison, A.B., Murphy, E., Peerwani, N., Peterson, J.L., Risinger, D.M., Sensabaugh, G.F., Spiegelman, C., Stern, H., Thompson, W.C., Wayman, J.L., Zabell, S. Zumwalt, R.E. (2016). Forensic

bitemark identification: Weak foundations, exaggerated claims. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, 1-38. Doi: 10.1093/jlb/law045

- Thompson, W.C. & Newman, E.J. (2015). Lay understanding of forensic statistics: Evaluation of random match probabilities, likelihood ratios, and verbal equivalents. *Law & Human Behavior*. 39(4): 332-349.
- Thompson, W.C., Vuille, J., Biedermann, A. & Taroni, F. (2013). The role of prior probability in forensic assessments. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 4: 220-223.
- Reprinted in: A. Biedermann, J. Vuille & F. Taroni (Eds.) *DNA, Statistics and the Law: A Cross-Disciplinary Approach to Forensic Inference*. Frontiers Research Topics, June 2014, pp. 13-15.
- Thompson, W.C., Kaasa, S.O., & Peterson, T. (2013). Do jurors give appropriate weight to forensic identification evidence? *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 10(2):359-97.
- Thompson, W.C. (2012). Discussion paper: Hard cases make bad law: Reactions to *R v. T. Law, Probability and Risk*, 11, 347-359.
- Biedermann, A., Taroni, F. & Thompson, W.C. (2011). Using graphical probability analysis (Bayes nets) to evaluate a conditional DNA inclusion. *Law, Probability and Risk*, 10, 89-121.
- Thompson, W.C. (2011). What role should investigative facts play in the evaluation of scientific evidence? *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*. 43(2-3): 123-134.
- Murphy, E. & Thompson, W.C. (2010). Understanding Potential Errors and Fallacies in Forensic DNA Statistics: An Amicus Brief in McDaniel v. Brown. *Criminal Law Bulletin*, 46(4), 709-757.
- Thompson, W.C. (2009). Painting the target around the matching profile: The Texas sharpshooter fallacy in forensic DNA interpretation. *Law, Probability and Risk*, 8, 257-276.
- Thompson, W.C. (2009). The National Research Council's plan to strengthen forensic science: Does the path forward run through the courts? *Jurimetrics Journal*, 50, 35-51.
- Thompson, W.C. (2008). Beyond bad apples: Analyzing the role of forensic science in wrongful convictions. *Southwestern Law Review*, 37(4), 1027-1050.
- Thompson, W.C. & Dioso-Villa, R. (2008). Turning a blind eye to misleading scientific testimony: Failure of procedural safeguards in a capital case. *Albany Law Journal of Science and Technology*, 18, 151-204.

- Kaasa, S.O., Peterson, T., Morris, E.K., & Thompson, W.C. (2007). Statistical inference and forensic evidence: Evaluating a bullet lead match. *Law & Human Behavior*, 31(5), 433-447.
- Koehler, J.J. & Thompson, W.C. (2006). Mock jurors' reactions to selective presentation of evidence from multiple-opportunity searches. *Law & Human Behavior*, 30, 455-468.
- Quas, J.A., Thompson, W.C., & Clarke-Stewart, C.K.A. (2005) Do jurors "know" what isn't so about child witnesses? *Law and Human Behavior*, 29, 425 – 456.
- Thompson, W.C. (2005) Analyzing the relevance and admissibility of bullet-lead evidence: Did the NRC report miss the target? *Jurimetrics Journal*, 46, 65-89.
- Thompson, W.C. How DNA evidence is transforming criminal justice. (May 2004) *Onyx: Journal of the Blackstone Society*, 48-55.
- Saks, M.J., Risinger, M., Rosenthal, R. & Thompson, W.C. (2003). Context effects in forensic science. *Science & Justice*, 43(2), 77-90.
- Thompson, W.C., Taroni, F. & Aitken, C.G.G. (2003). How the probability of a false positive affects the value of DNA evidence. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 48(1), 47-54.
- Risinger, D.M., Saks, M.J., Thompson, W.C. & Rosenthal, R. (2002). The Daubert/Kumho implications of observer effects in forensic science: Hidden problems of expectation and suggestion. *California Law Review*, 90(1), 1-56.
- Thompson, W.C. & Pathak, M.K. (1999). Empirical Study of Hearsay Rules: Bridging the Gap Between Psychology and Law. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 5(2), 456-472 (1999).
- Pathak, M.K. & Thompson, W.C. (1999). From Child to Witness to Jury: Effects of Suggestion on the Transmission of Hearsay. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 5(2), 372-387.
- Thompson, W.C. (1997). Accepting Lower Standards: The National Research Council's Second Report on Forensic DNA Evidence. *Jurimetrics Journal*, 37(4) 405-424.
- Thompson, W.C., Clarke-Stewart, K.A., & Lepore, S.J. (1997). What did the janitor do? Suggestive interviewing and the accuracy of children's accounts, *Law & Human Behavior*, 21(4), 405-426.
- Thompson, W.C. (1997). A Sociological Perspective on the Science of Forensic DNA Testing. *U.C. Davis Law Review*, 30(4), 1113-1136.
- Thompson, W.C. (1996). DNA Evidence in the O.J. Simpson Trial, *Colorado Law Review*, 67 (4), 827-857.
- Thompson, W.C. (1995). Subjective interpretation, laboratory error and the value of DNA evidence: Three case studies, *Genetica*, 96: 153-168.

- Reprinted in B.S. Weir (Ed.) *Human Identification: The Use of DNA Markers*.
Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995, 153-168.
- Thompson, W.C. (1993). Evaluating the admissibility of new genetic identification tests: Lessons from the "DNA War". *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 84, 22-104.
- Thompson, W.C. (1989). Death qualification after Wainwright v. Witt and Lockhart v. McCree. *Law and Human Behavior*, 13, 185-215.
- Thompson, W.C. (1989). Are juries competent to evaluate statistical evidence? *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 52, 9-41.
- Thompson, W.C. & Ford, S. (1989). DNA typing: Acceptance and weight of the new genetic identification tests. *Virginia Law Review*, 75, 45-108.
- Reprinted in *Criminal Practice Law Review*, 1989, 2, 103-162.
- Plagiarized in Harvey, B.S. & Berry, J.D., DNA typing: Keeping the state out of your client's genes. *The Champion*, 1989, 13, 6-9.
- Reprinted in *Daily Journal Report*, October 27, 1989, 18-46.
- Reprinted in *California Defender*, 1990, 4, 2-25.
- Melton, G.B., Levine, R.J., Koocher, G.P., Rosenthal, R. & Thompson, W.C. (1988). Community consultation in socially sensitive research: Lessons from clinical trials of treatments for AIDS. *American Psychologist*, 43, 573-581.
- Reprinted in Udo Schuklenk (Ed.) *Aids, Society, Ethics and Law*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing Limited (2001).
- Thompson, W.C. & Schumann, E.L. (1987). Interpretation of statistical evidence in criminal trials: The prosecutor's fallacy and the defense attorney's fallacy. *Law and Human Behavior*, 11, 167-187.
- Cowan, C.L., Thompson, W.C. & Ellsworth, P.E. (1984). The effects of death qualification on juror's predisposition to convict and on the quality of deliberation. *Law and Human Behavior*, 8, 53-79.
- Cited by the U.S. Supreme Court
- Thompson, W.C., Cowan, C.L., Ellsworth, P.E. & Harrington, J. (1984). Death penalty attitudes and conviction proneness: The translation of attitudes into verdicts. *Law and Human Behavior*, 8, 95-113.
- Cited by the U.S. Supreme Court
- Ellsworth, P.E., Cowan, C.L., Bukaty, R. & Thompson, W.C. (1984). The death qualified jury and the defense of insanity. *Law and Human Behavior*, 8, 81-93.
- Cited by the U.S. Supreme Court
- Thompson, W.C., Fong, G. & Rosenhan, D.L. (1981). Inadmissible evidence and juror verdicts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 453-465.

-- Abstracted in *Psychology Today*

Thompson, W.C., Cowan, C.L. & Rosenhan, D.L. (1980). Focus of attention mediates the impact of negative affect on altruism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 291-302.

Reyes, R.M., Thompson, W.C. & Bower, G.H. (1980). Judgmental biases resulting from differing availabilities of arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 2-12.

Redleaf, D., Schmitt, S. & Thompson, W.C. (1979). The California Natural Death Act: An empirical study of physicians' practices. *Stanford Law Review*, 31, 913-943.

-- Abstracted in *The Hastings Center Report*, 1980 (April) p.51.

Peer-reviewed articles in professional/practitioner journals

Thompson, W.C., Mueller, L.D., & Krane, D.E. (Dec. 2012). Forensic DNA statistics: Still controversial in some cases. *The Champion*, 36, 12-23. (Cover article)

Tobin, W.A. & Thompson, W.C. (July 2006). Evaluating and challenging forensic identification evidence. *The Champion*, 30, 12-21. (Cover article)

--Reprinted in V. Raghuram (Ed.)(2007) *Expert Opinion: Evidentiary Value*. Hyderabad, India: The Icfai University Press. pp. 137-59.

Thompson, W.C. (January 2006). Tarnish on the 'gold standard:' Understanding recent problems in forensic DNA testing. *The Champion*, 30(1), 10-16 (Cover Article).

--Reprinted in *California Defender* (Spring 2012), 71-78.

Thompson, W.C., Ford, S., Doom, T., Raymer, M. & Krane, D. (2003a) Evaluating Forensic DNA Evidence: Essential Elements of a Competent Defense Review: Part 1. *The Champion*, 27(3), 16-25 (Cover Article)

Thompson, W.C., Ford, S., Doom, T., Raymer, M. & Krane, D. (2003b) Evaluating Forensic DNA Evidence: Essential Elements of a Competent Defense Review: Part 2. *The Champion*, 27(4), 24-28.

--Cited by the U.S. Supreme Court

Other journal, magazine, online and proceedings articles

Thompson, W.C. (Nov-Dec. 2008). The potential for error in forensic DNA testing. *GeneWatch*, 21(3-4), 5-8.

Schmechel, R.S., Thompson, W.C. & Ungvarsky, E.J. (August, 2005). Defending with (and against) forensic evidence: A call to share resources. *The Champion*, 29, 39-40.

- Nethercott, M & Thompson, W.C. (June 2005). Lessons from Baltimore's GSR debacle. *The Champion*, 29, 50-52.
- Thompson, W.C. & Cole, S.A. (March 2005). Lessons from the Brandon Mayfield case. *The Champion*, 29, 32-34.
- Thompson, W.C. & Nethercott, M. (Sept-Oct, 2004). The challenge of forensic evidence. *The Champion*, 28, 50-51.
- Thompson, W.C. (2003). Houston has a problem: How bad DNA evidence sent the wrong man to prison. *Cornerstone*, 25(1), 16-17
- Thompson, W.C. People v. Marshall: The Legal Story. *Scientific Testimony: An Online Journal*, www.scientific.org (1998).
- Thompson, W.C. Examiner Bias in Forensic RFLP Analysis. *Scientific Testimony: An Online Journal*, www.scientific.org (1998).
- Thompson, W.C. & Thoma, J.E., (1997-98). Selective Bibliography on Forensic DNA Evidence, 1997-1998. *California Defender*, 7(3&4), 35-44.
- Thompson, W.C. & Thoma, J.E. (1996). Selective bibliography on forensic DNA evidence. *CACJ Forum*, 23(1), 86-95.
- Thompson, W.C. (January 1995). DNA Evidence: The State of the Science, *Bulletin of Law, Science and Technology*, 1-7.
- Thompson, W.C. (August, 1994). DNA Evidence in Criminal Law: New Developments, *Trial*, 30(8), 34-42.
- Expert Opinion: DNA Testing Under Fire (Excerpts of a Debate between William Thompson and George W. ("Woody") Clarke, moderated by Nina Schuyler). *California Lawyer* (October, 1994, 45-48).
- Thompson, W.C. & Pathak, M.K. (1993). Evaluating the trustworthiness of hearsay: Truthful in part, truthful in whole? *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Forensic Statistics*, F, 49-54.
- Thompson, W.C. & Ford, S. (1993). Is the probative value of forensic DNA evidence undermined by subjectivity in determination of matches? *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Forensic Statistics*, A, 47-60.
- Thompson, W.C. & Thoma, J.E. (1993). Selective bibliography on forensic DNA evidence. *CACJ Forum*, 20(4), 71-73.
- Thompson, W.C. (October, 1993) The DNA testing debate: Where do we stand and what have we learned. *Orange County Lawyer*.
- Thompson, W.C. & Ford, S. (April 1992). DNA testing: Debate update. *Trial*, 28, 52-61.
- Ford, S. & Thompson, W.C. (1990). A question of identity: Some reasonable doubts about DNA "fingerprints". *The Sciences*, January/February, 36-43.
-- Reprinted in *The Forum*, June 1990.

-- Reprinted in *California Defender*, 1990, 4, 42-48.

Thompson, W.C. & Ford, S. (1990). Is DNA fingerprinting ready for the courts? *New Scientist*, March 31, 1990, vol 125, 38-43. (Cover story)

-- Reprinted in *California Defender*, 1990, 4, 36-41.

Thompson, W.C. & Ford, S. (September 1988). DNA Typing: Promising forensic technique needs additional validation. *Trial*, 56-64.

Chapters in edited volumes

Thompson, W.C. (2015). Determining the Proper Evidentiary Basis for an Expert Opinion: What Do Experts Need to Know and When Do They Know Too Much? In C. Robertson & A. Kesselheim (Eds.) *Blinding as a Solution to Bias: Strengthening Biomedical Science, Forensic Science, and Law*. Elsevier, Inc. pp. 133-150.

Cole, S.A. & Thompson, W.C. (2013). Forensic Science and Wrongful Convictions. In, C.R.Huff & M.Killias, *Wrongful Convictions and Miscarriages of Justice: Causes and Remedies in North American and European Criminal Justice Systems*. Routledge, pp. 111-135.

Thompson, W.C. Forensic DNA Evidence: The Myth of Infallibility. In Sheldon Krimsky & Jeremy Gruber (Eds.), *Genetic Explanations: Sense and Nonsense*. Harvard University Press, 2013, pp. 227-255.

Thompson W.C., (2009). Interpretation: Observer Effects, in *Wiley Encyclopedia of Forensic Science*, Jamieson, A., Moenssens, A. (eds). John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, UK, pp 1575-1579.

Cole, S.A & Thompson, W.C. (2007). Legal issues associated with DNA evidence. In Craig Hemmens (Ed.), *Legal Issues for Criminal Justice*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Thompson, W.C. & Cole, S.A. (2007). Psychological aspects of forensic identification evidence. In M. Costanzo, D. Krauss & K. Pezdek (Eds.) *Expert Psychological Testimony for the Courts*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates, pp. 31-68.

Thompson, W.C. & Krane, D.E. (2003). DNA in the courtroom. In J. Moriarty (Ed.) *Psychological and Scientific Evidence in Criminal Trials*. Minneapolis: West Group. (Sections 11:1 - 11:43).

Saks, M.J. & Thompson, W.C. (2003). Assessing Evidence: Proving Facts. In D. Carson and R. Bull (Eds.) *Handbook of Psychology in Legal Contexts*. John Wiley & Sons, pp. 329-345.

Thompson, W.C. (2002). DNA Testing. In David Levinson (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

--Excerpt reprinted in: R. Lempert, S. Gross, J. Liebman, J. Blume, S. Landsman & F. Lederer (Eds.) *A Modern Approach to Evidence: Texts, Problems, Transcripts and Cases*, West Academic Publishing, 2013, pp. 1247-59.

Thompson, W.C. & Fuqua, J. (1998). "The Jury Will Disregard...": A Brief Guide to Inadmissible Evidence. In J. Golding & C. MacLeod, *Intentional Forgetting: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

Thompson, W.C. (1997). Forensic DNA Evidence, In Bert Black and Patrick Lee (Eds.) *Expert Evidence: A Practitioner's Guide to Law, Science and the FJC Manual*, pp. 196-266. West Publishing.

--Excerpt reprinted in R. Lempert, S. Gross & S. Liebman, *A Modern Approach to Evidence*, West Publishing, 1999, 769-783.

Thompson, W.C. (1996). Research on human judgment and decision making: Implications for informed consent and institutional review. In B. Stanley, J. Sieber & G. Melton, *Research Ethics: A Psychological Approach*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press (1996).

Thompson, W.C. (1994). When science enters the courtroom: The DNA typing controversy. In C. Cranor (Ed.) *Are Genes Us? The Social Consequences of the New Genetics*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, p. 180-202.

Thompson, W.C. (1993). Genetics and criminal justice. In R. Steven Brown (Ed.) *Advances in Genetics Information: A Guide for State Policy Makers*. Lexington, Ky.: Council of State Governments.

Thompson, W.C. (1993). Research on jury decision making: The state of the science. In N.J. Castellan (Ed.) *Current Issues in Individual and Group Decision Making*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Thompson, W.C. & Ford, S. (1991). The meaning of a match: Sources of ambiguity in the interpretation of DNA prints. In J. Farley & J. Harrington (Eds.) *Forensic DNA Technology*. New York: CRC Press, Inc., 1991.

Thompson, W.C. (1983). Psychological issues in informed consent. In The President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research (Eds.) *Making Health Care Decisions: Vol 3: Appendices: Studies on the Foundations of Informed Consent* (pp 83-115) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Book reviews

Thompson, W.C. & Vuille, J. Math on Trial. *California Lawyer* (Nov. 2013).

Thompson, W.C. (Jan 4, 2013). Rejecting the Evidence (Review of David A. Harris, *Failed Evidence: Why Law Enforcement Resists Science*). *Science*, 339, 34-35.

Thompson, W.C. (Nov.-Dec. 2010). Lessons from the 'DNA wars' (Review of David H. Kaye, *The Double Helix and the Law of Evidence*). *Judicature*, 94(3) 142-44.

Dioso, R. & Thompson, W.C. (2006). Review of: DNA and the criminal justice system:

The technology of justice. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 51(1), 206-07.

Thompson, W.C., Peterson, T. & Kaasa, S.O. (2004). Reflections on "Psychology and Law" (Review of Taking Psychology and Law Into the Twenty-First Century, James R.P. Ogloff (Ed.), *PsycCRITIQUES*, 49, Supplement 14, np.

Brief commentary and letters in scientific journals

Salyards, J., MacCrehan, W., Denton, B., Kafadar, K., Lednev, I., Stern, H. & Thompson, W. Letter to the Editors regarding Rodriguez-Cruz & Montreuil "Assessing the quality and reliability of the DEA drug identification process." *Forensic Chemistry* 6 (2017): 36-43. *Forensic Chemistry*, 13, May 2019, 100147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2019.100147>

Thompson, W.C. & Scurich, N. (2018). When does absence of evidence constitute evidence of absence? *Forensic Science International*, 291 e18-e19.

Adams, N., Koppl, R., Krane, D., Thompson, W.C. & Zabell, S. (2018) Appropriate standards for verification and validation of probabilistic genotyping systems. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 63(1): 339-40.

Koppl, R., Charlton, D., Kornfield, I., Krane, D., Risinger, D.M., Robertson, C. Saks, M. & Thompson, W.C. (2015). Do observer effects matter? A comment on Langenburg, Bochet, and Ford. *Forensic Science Policy and Management*, 6(1-2): 1-6. ISSN: 1940-9044 print / 1940-9036 online; DOI: 10.1080/19409044.2014.995385

Dror, I.E., Thompson, W.C., Meissner, C.A., Kornfield, I., Krane, D., Saks, M. & Risinger, D.M. (2015). Context management toolbox: A linear sequential unmasking (LSU) approach for minimizing cognitive bias in forensic decision making. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 60(4): 1111-1112. DOI: 10.1111/1556-4029.12805

Risinger, D.M., Thompson, W.C., Jamieson, A., Koppl, R. Kornfield, I., Krane, D., Mnookin, J., Rosenthal, R., Saks, M.J., and Zabell, S. Regarding Champod, editorial: "Research focused mainly on bias will paralyse forensic science." *Science and Justice*, 54(6): 508-509. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2014.06.002> (Published online June 2014).

Thompson, W.C. (2012). Discussion on the paper by Neumann, Evett and Skerrett. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, 175, Part 2, 409.

Thompson, W.C., Ford, S., Gilder, J.R., Inman, K., Jamieson, A., Koppl, R., Kornfield, I.L., Krane, D., Mnookin, J.L., Risinger, D.M., Rudin, N., Saks, M.J., & Zabell, S. (2011). Commentary on: Thornton—A rejection of 'working blind' as a cure for contextual bias. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 56(2) 562-63.

- Thompson, W.C. (2010). An American Psychology-Law Society Scientific Review Paper on Police Interrogation and Confession. *Law & Human Behavior*, 34(1) 1-2.
- Krane, D.E., Ford, S. Gilder, J.R., Inman, K., Jamieson, A., Koppl, R., Kornfield, I.L., Risinger, D.M., Rudin, N., Taylor, M.S., & Thompson, W.C. (2010) Commentary on Budowle, et al. A perspective on errors, bias and interpretation in the forensic sciences and directions for continuing advancement. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 55(1) 273-274.
- D. E. Krane, V. Bahn, D. Balding, B. Barlow, H. Cash, B. L. Desportes, P. D'Eustachio, K. Devlin, T. E. Doom, I. Dror, S. Ford, C. Funk, J. Gilder, G. Hampikian, K. Inman, A. Jamieson, P. E. Kent, R. Koppl, I. Kornfield, S. Krinsky, J. Mnookin, L. Mueller, E. Murphy, D. R. Paoletti, D. A. Petrov, M. Raymer, D. M. Risinger, A. Roth, N. Rudin, W. Shields, J. A. Siegel, M. Slatkin, Y. S. Song, T. Speed, C. Spiegelman, P. Sullivan, A. R. Swienton, T. Tarpey, W. C. THOMPSON, E. Ungvarsky, S. Zabell. (2009). Time for DNA Disclosure. *Science*, 326, 1631-32 (Dec. 18, 2009)
- Krane, D.E., Ford, S., Gilder, J., Inman, K., Jamieson, A., Koppl, R., Kornfield, I., Risinger, D.M., Rudin, N., Taylor, M.S. & Thompson, W.C. (2009). Reply to Ostrum. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 54(6) 1500-1501.
- Gilder, J., Koppl, R., Kornfield, I., Krane, D., Mueller, L. & Thompson, W. Comment on the review of low copy number testing. *International Journal of Legal Medicine* (Published online Sept. 18, 2008; forthcoming in journal)
- Thompson, W.C. (2009). The Prosecutor's Fallacy in George Clarke's "Justice and Science: Trials and Triumphs of DNA Evidence." *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 54(2): 504.
- Krane, D.E., Ford, S., Gilder, J., Inman, K., Jamieson, A., Koppl, R., Kornfield, I., Risinger, D.M., Rudin, N., Taylor, M.S. & Thompson, W.C (2009). Authors' Response (to commentary on Sequential Unmasking). *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 54(2): 501.
- Krane, D.E., Ford, S., Gilder, J., Inman, K., Jamieson, A., Koppl, R., Kornfield, I., Risinger, D.M., Rudin, N., Taylor, M.S. & Thompson, W.C. (2008). Sequential unmasking: A means of minimizing observer effects in forensic DNA interpretation. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 53(4):1006-7.
- Krane, D.E., Doom, T.E., Mueller, L., Raymer, M.L., Shields, W.M. & Thompson, W.C. (2004). Commentary on: Budowle, et al. CODIS STR loci data from 41 sample populations. *J Forensic Sci* 2001; 46:453-489 (Letter). *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 49(6).

- Thompson, W.C., Taroni, F. & Aitken, C.G.G. (2004). Authors' response (to letter by Brenner and Inman re: Thompson, Taroni & Aitken, 2003). *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 49(1) 194-95.
- Thompson, W.C., Taroni, F. & Aitken, C.G.G. (2003). Authors' Response (to letters by Cotton & Word, Clarke re: Thompson, Taroni & Aitken, 2003). *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 48(5), 1202
- cited by U.S. Supreme Court (Justice Breyer's concurrence in *Williams v. Illinois*, 2012).
- Thompson, W.C. (1998). Additional commentary on Budowle et al. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 43(2) 447-448.
- Thompson, W.C. (1995). Discussion of the paper by Balding and Donnelly, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 158(A), 49.
- Thompson, W.C. (1994). Comment (on K. Roeder, DNA Fingerprinting: A Review of the Controversy). *Statistical Science*, 9, 263-266.
- Thompson, W.C. (1993). Worthwhile DNA questions (letter) *Judicature*, 77, 5-6.

Commentary and op/ed articles in newspapers and magazines

- Thompson, W.C. & Spiegelman, C. Who should control Houston's crime lab? *Houston Chronicle* (Posted online May 31, 2016; print edition June 1, 2016).
<http://www.houstonchronicle.com/opinion/outlook/article/Who-should-control-Houston-s-crime-lab-7955271.php>
- Mentch, L., Cuellar, M., Thompson, W.C. & Spiefelman, C. Four experts explain why forensic analysis of crime scenes is not as reliable as you might think. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* (March 13, 2016).
- Thompson, W.C. A setback for forensic science. *Washington Post*, May 8, 2015.
- Thompson, W.C. & Friedman, J. Statewide oversight of forensic science needed in California. *Los Angeles Daily Journal* (June 22, 2010).
- Quintin Chatman, Moderator, Roundtable on the NAS Report (with commentary from Michael Burt, Hon. J.S. Rakoff, Adina Schwartz and William C. Thompson). *The Champion*, 33(7), Aug. 2009, 36-43.
- Thompson, W.C. At Issue: Should forensic labs be separated from law enforcement agencies? *CQ Researcher*, July 17, 2009, p. 613 (debate with John M. Collins).
- Cole, S.A. & Thompson, W.C. Lawyers should view scientific evidence with critical eye. *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, Sept 20, 2005

- Cole, S.A. & Thompson, W.C. FBI needs to make more changes in fingerprint analysis. *San Francisco Daily Journal*, Nov 26, 2004, 4.
- Cole, S.A. & Thompson, W.C. DNA initiative is wrong way of expanding state's database. *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, Oct 25, 2004.
- Thompson, W.C. Commentary: Keep Your Hands Off My DNA. *Los Angeles Times*, Oct 14, 2004, B-11
- Thompson, W.C. HPD Crime Lab Mess: Worse Than Imagined? *Houston Chronicle*, Sunday Outlook, September 28, 2003.
- Thompson, W.C. Grand juries alone won't cut through HPD's crime lab tangle. *Houston Chronicle*, Sunday Outlook, June 15, 2003.
- Thompson, W.C. Separate the Lab from the FBI. *Orange County Register*, June 1, 1997.

Published legal briefs

- Brief of 20 Scholars of Forensic Evidence as *Amici Curiae* Supporting Respondents in *McDaniel v. Brown*, 130 S. Ct. 665 (2010)(with Erin Murphy). Reprinted in *Criminal Law Bulletin*, 46(4) 711-757 (2010).
- Motion to Exclude DNA Evidence in *United States v. Cuff*, 37 F.Supp.2d 279 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)(prepared by William C. Thompson). Reprinted in BNA Criminal Practice Guide, January 12, 2000, p. 14-18.
- Memorandum in Support of Motion to Exclude DNA Evidence in *People v. O.J. Simpson*, No. BA 97211, Los Angeles County Superior Court (with Barry Scheck and Peter Neufeld). Excerpt reprinted in BNA Criminal Practice Manual, 1994, 8, 583-590.
- Defense Opening Brief on the Admissibility of Forensic DNA Evidence in *State of New Mexico v. Jay Anderson*, No. CR 46255, Bernalillo County, N.M. (with Dan Cron and Angela Arellanes). Reprinted in BNA Criminal Practice Manual, 1990, 4, 180-185.

Government Publications

- Gillette et al. (2009). An Examination of Forensic Science in California. California Crime Laboratory Review Task Force, California Department of Justice, Sacramento, CA.

RECENT PRESENTATIONS

Invited Addresses at International Conferences

- The AAAS Report and the Future of Latent Fingerprint Examination. Invited address at the 18th Meeting of the ENFSI Fingerprint Working Group, Lausanne, Switzerland, Sept. 5, 2018.

Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge UK. Invited addresses at workshops on probability and statistical methods in court (August 30, 2016) Bayesian Networks and Argumentation in Evidence Analysis (September 29, 2016), and Statistical Modeling of Scientific Evidence (Nov 8, 2016), as part of Programme on Probability and Statistics in Forensic Science (July – Dec, 2016).

National Judicial Institute of Canada. Evidence Workshop. Victoria, British Columbia, July 27-31, 2014.

Lorentz Center, University of Leiden, Netherlands. Invited address at the conference *Science Meets Justice: Forensic Statistics at the Interface*. April 26, 2011.

Forensic Advisory Council of the Forensic Science Regulator of Great Britain. Workshop on Contextual Bias. London, U.K. March 1, 2011.

Australia-New Zealand Forensic Science Society (ANZFSS). Invited plenary address. Sydney, Australia, September 7, 2010.

7th International Conference on Forensic Inference and Statistics, Invited Keynote Address. Lausanne, Switzerland. August 2008.

Inaugural Conference of the Innocence Project New Zealand. Invited address. Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand, December 14, 2007.

Criminal Courts Bar Association of Northern Ireland. Workshop on DNA Evidence (with Dan Krane), Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland. October 13, 2007.

10th International Criminal Law Congress. Keynote address. Perth, Australia, October 19, 2006.

Department of Biology, Murdoch University. Invited address. Perth, Australia. October 2006.

Australia-New Zealand Forensic Science Society. Keynote Address. Wellington, New Zealand, March 2004.

Australian Psychology-Law Society. Invited address. Perth, Australia, March 2004.

Conference on Human Rights and the Protection of Innocence. Invited address. University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia, March 2004.

Judicial education and training

Appellate Judicial Attorneys Institute, Judicial Council of California. Invited presentation on cognitive bias in forensic science. Anaheim, CA. April 14, 2016.

Appellate Judicial Attorneys Institute, Judicial Council of California. Invited presentation on mathematical evidence. San Francisco, CA. April 14, 2015.

Evidence Workshop. National Judicial Institute of Canada. (Faculty member for national training conference for Canadian judges). Victoria, British Columbia, July 27-31, 2014.

Judicial Conference of Virginia. Invited address. Virginia Beach, Va. May 16, 2006.

Criminal Bench Seminar. Invited panel discussion for judges of the Los Angeles County Superior Court on DNA evidence (with R. Cotton K. Inman, & M. Taylor). Los Angeles, CA. October 2004.

Advanced Judicial Studies Institute. Training Workshop on DNA evidence for Missouri Trial Judges), with Brian Hoey. Jefferson City, Mo. April 18-19, 2002.

Advanced Judicial Studies Institute. Training Workshop on DNA evidence for Missouri Trial Judges), with Brian Hoey. Columbia, Mo. May 7-9, 2001.

Legal education and training

Framework for Evaluating Forensic Science Evidence, National Forensics College, June 2, 2018.

Cognitive bias in forensic science. Capital Defense Seminar, California Public Defender Association and California Attorneys for Criminal Justice, Monterey, CA. Feb 17, 2018.

Statistics and Quantification, Capital Defense Seminar, California Public Defender Association and California Attorneys for Criminal Justice, Monterey, CA. Feb 18, 2018.

Explaining Source Conclusions to a Lay Audience. CSAFE Webinar, Nov 30, 2017.

Forensic Science Assessment: Latent Fingerprint Examination. Presentation to the Legal Aid Society of New York, Cardozo Law School, New York, October 25, 2017.

Center for American and International Law. Annual Program: Establishing Guilt and Innocence. Plano Texas, August 29-30, 2016 (appearance by video-link).

Cognitive bias in forensic science. National Forensic College, Cardozo Law School, New York, N.Y. June 5, 2016.

Capital Defense Seminar, California Public Defender Association and California Attorneys for Criminal Justice. "Cognitive Bias in Forensic Science." San Diego, Ca. February 13, 2016

Capital Defense Seminar, California Public Defender Association and California Attorneys for Criminal Justice. "The National Commission on Forensic Science." San Diego, Ca. February 13, 2016 (with Sandra Leveck)

National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL). Forensic Science Seminar, Las Vegas, Nev. April 18, 2015.

National Forensic College, Faculty member for week-long training conference. Cardozo Law School, New York, N.Y. June 8-13, 2014.

National Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys. Invited address. Washington, D.C. Feb 22, 2013.

Office of the Public Defender, San Francisco, CA. Workshop on DNA Statistics. Nov 16, 2012.

Forensic Science Training Conference, National Institute of Justice and the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office, Invited address. Sept 17, 2011.

Benjamin Arranda III, Inn of Court, Redondo Beach, CA. Invited address. Nov 17, 2010.

National Association of Appellate Court Attorneys. Plenary address. Annapolis, MD., July 15, 2009.

West Coast DNA Trial College, Golden Gate Law School, Faculty member. San Francisco, CA. March 28, 2009.

DNA Cross Examination College (Advanced training seminar for litigators), Faculty member. Public Defender Service, Washington, D.C., March 23-24, 2007.

West Coast DNA Trial College, University of San Francisco Law School (2-day workshop), Faculty Member, March 17-18, 2007.

Recent invited addresses and presentations (government agencies, universities and professional societies)

A new crisis in forensic science. USC Law School, Los Angeles, CA., Jan 22, 2018.

What should forensic scientists be allowed to say about source conclusions. Annual Conference of the American Association of Law Schools, San Diego, CA. Jan 6, 2018.

How Should Forensic Scientists Present Source Conclusions. Seton Hall University School of Law, Newark, N.J. October 27, 2017.

Statistical concepts for lawyers. Workshop presentation at a training conference of the National Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys (NACDL), Mar 23, 2017.

Validity and reliability of latent fingerprint analysis. Invited address at the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Boston, MA. Feb 18, 2017

Lay understanding of forensic science. Invited presentation to the National Commission on Forensic Science, Washington, D.C. Jan 10, 2017.

Lay reactions to statements about the weight of forensic science evidence. Colloquium Presentation, Faculty of Law, Criminal Justice and Public Administration, University of Lausanne. August 15, 2016

Testing forensic laboratories: Conceptual and practical issues. Forensics Transitions Workshop. Statistics

and Mathematical Science Institute (SAMSI), Durham, North Carolina, May 10, 2016.

Lay reactions to quantitative statements about the weight of forensic science evidence. Technical Colloquium on Quantifying the Weight of Forensic Evidence. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), May 5, 2016.

Improving expert evidence: Views from the university and the courtroom (with Jennifer Keller). Views-by-Two Presentation. Center for Psychology & Law, University of California, Irvine. May 2, 2016.

Cognitive Bias in Forensic Science. Statistics and Mathematical Science Institute (SAMSI), Durham, North Carolina, December 1, 2015.

Task-relevance: What is the proper evidentiary basis for a forensic science opinion? Netherlands Forensic Institute, The Hague, Netherlands, September 15, 2015

Managing contextual bias in forensic science. Forensics Workshop. Statistics and Mathematical Science Institute (SAMSI), Durham, North Carolina, September 1, 2015.

Moot Court Presentation. International Symposium on Forensic Science Error Management, Washington, D.C. July 24, 2015.

What is the proper evidentiary basis for a forensic science opinion. Invited plenary address at the International Symposium on Forensic Science Error Management, Washington, D.C. July 24, 2015.

The OSAC Human Factors Committee. Invited address at the meeting of the California Association of Criminalists, Ventura, Ca. May 6, 2015.

Overcoming contextual bias: Are good intentions and willpower enough? Invited plenary address at the annual meeting of the American Association of Forensic Sciences, Orlando, Florida Feb. 19, 2015.

Contextual bias and task-relevance: Lessons from WMD forensics. Workshop presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association of Forensic Sciences, Orlando, Florida Feb. 17, 2015.

The Human Factors Resource Committee. Presentation at the meeting of the Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC), Norman, Oklahoma, Jan. 2015.

Sherlock Holmes Syndrome: Why forensic scientists make bad detectives (and vice-versa). Invited presentation for the Center for Psychology and Law, UC Irvine, Oct 27, 2014.

Minimizing contextual bias. Invited presentation to the National Commission on Forensic Science. Washington, D.C. Aug. 26, 2014.

How should forensic scientists explain their evidence to juries? Invited address at the 2014 Stanford Symposium on Law & Rationality: Trial With and Without Mathematics. Stanford University, May 30, 2014.

Workshop on Minimizing Contextual Bias. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Association of Forensic Document Examiners. Las Vegas, NV. April 25, 2014.

Invited Lecture on Forensic Statistics. Masters Program in Forensic Sciences, California State University, Los Angeles, CA. April 9, 2014.

How jurors understand (and sometimes misunderstand) forensic science evidence. Presented at the meeting of the California Association of Crime Laboratory Directors, Costa Mesa, CA. April 4, 2014.

Thompson, W.C. Communicating forensic science evidence. Presented at the meeting of the Scientific Working Group for Forensic and Investigatory Speaker Recognition, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD March 19, 2014.

Blind to What? Criteria for Task-Relevance. Presentation during the Workshop on Contextual Bias in Forensic Science at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Seattle, WA Feb. 17, 2014.

Communicating forensic science evidence. Invited Lecture. Advanced Seminar on Evidence, UCLA School of Law. Feb 6, 2014.

Communicating forensic science evidence. Invited presentation at the Orange County Crime Laboratory. Dec 18, 2013.

Communicating scientific findings to lawyers, policy-makers and the public. Invited presentation at the annual meeting of the American Geophysical Union. San Francisco, CA. Dec 10, 2013.

Modeling task-relevance: What facts should experts ignore? Invited presentation at the Symposium: When Less Information is Better: Blinding as a Solution to Institutional Corruption. The Edmond J. Safra Center, Harvard University. Nov. 1, 2013.

California Forensic Science Network, Summer 2014 Meeting, Santa Ana, CA.

Expert Evidence Workshop, School of Law, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, July 8-9,

2013.

How Should Forensic Scientists Explain Their Evidence to Juries: Match Probabilities, Likelihood Ratios, or "Verbal Equivalents"? Invited presentation at the Workshop on Forensic Evidence, Program on Understanding Law, Science and Evidence (PULSE), School of Law, UCLA. June 6, 2013.

Reducing error and bias in forensic science. Presentation to the Forensic Evidence Group, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Oct 17, 2012.

The Continuing Battle Over Forensic DNA Statistics, Workshop on Forensic Evidence, Program on Understanding Law, Science and Evidence, School of Law, UCLA. June 1, 2012.

Civil Liberties, Privacy and Government DNA Databases. Invited presentation at the conference on The Constitution in the Age of Technology, UCLA Department of Political Science, May 30, 2012.

Legal Standards for the Admissibility of Expert Testimony: Implication of the 2009 NRC Report on Forensic Sciences. Invited address at the annual meeting of the Acoustical Society of America, San Diego, Ca. Nov 3, 2011.

Blind to What? What should forensic scientists know, and when should they know it? Invited presentation at the Cognitive Bias and Forensic Science Workshop, Northwestern University School of Law, Sept 21, 2010.

Observer effects in forensic science. Psychology-Law Colloquium at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. September 1, 2010.

How CSI went awry, and how to fix it. Invited address in the "Distinctive Voices" Series at the Beckman Center of the National Academies of Science, Irvine, California. September 2, 2009.

Should forensic scientists be allowed to testify about source probabilities? Invited presentation at the conference *Forensic Science for the 21st Century: The National Academy of Sciences Report and Beyond*, Arizona State University Law School, Tempe, Arizona, April 4, 2009.

Strengthening forensic science: Does the 'path forward' run through the courts? Invited presentation at the conference *Forensic Science for the 21st Century: The National Academy of Sciences Report and Beyond*, Arizona State University Law School, Tempe, Arizona, April 3, 2009.

Invited Panelist, American Civil Liberties Union Panel on Technology and the Future, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. October 25, 2006.

DNA Testing Problems in Texas and Virginia. Invited address at the meeting of the California Association of Criminalists, Los Angeles, California, October 2005.

DNA Testing Problems in Virginia. Invited presentation at 4th Annual Forensic Bioinformatics Conference, University of Dayton Law School, Dayton, Ohio, August 2005

Lab Scandals: Lessons for Reform. Invited presentation at the DePaul University Law School Conference on Science and Law, Chicago, Ill. May 2005.

Refereed conference papers

Lay understanding of expert testimony on likelihood ratios. European Academy of Forensic Sciences, Prague, Cz. September 7, 2015

Modeling the criminalists' paradox: A Bayesian analysis of domain relevance. European Academy of Forensic Sciences, Prague, Cz. September 7, 2015.

Thompson, W.C. & Newman, E.J. Lay understanding of forensic statistics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, San Diego, CA. March 21, 2015.

Thompson, W.C. Attacking non-Bayesian reasoning. Presentation at the 52nd Edwards Bayesian Research Conference. California State University, Fullerton, Ca. Feb 15, 2014.

Thompson, W.C. Jurors' Reactions to Forensic Evidence. Presentation at the 51st Edwards Bayesian Research Conference. California State University, Fullerton, Ca. Feb 15, 2013.

Thompson, W.C., Fowler, N.B., Dioso-Villa, R. & Velazquez, B. When do jurors treat absence of evidence as evidence of absence? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, San Antonio, Texas March 7, 2009.

Thompson, W.C., Kaasa, S. & Peterson, T. The false positive fallacy in jurors' evaluations of forensic evidence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA. August 2007.

DesPortes, B.L. & Thompson, W.C. Recent problems in forensic DNA testing. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, San Antonio, Texas, Feb. 2007.

- Thompson, Dioso, R., Velasquez, B., Peterson, T. & Thompson, W.C. Misuse of DNA Evidence: A Case Study. Presented at Faces of Wrongful Conviction, a conference at UCLA Law School, April 2006.
- Kaasa, S.O., Morris, E.K., Peterson, T. & Thompson, W.C. Evaluation of Bullet Lead Evidence: Are Mock Jurors as Smart as They Think They Are? Presented at the National Academy of Sciences' Arthur M. Sackler Colloquium on Forensic Science, Washington, D.C. November 2005.
- Thompson, W.C. The Houston Police Crime Lab Debacle: Exploring a Systemic Justice System Failure. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Law & Society Association, Las Vegas, Nev. June 2005.
- Kaasa, S.O., Morris, E.K., Peterson, T. & Thompson, W.C. Mock jurors' evaluations of bullet lead evidence. Presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Portland, Oregon, April 2005.
- Thompson, W.C. Problematic DNA Evidence. Presented at the Sixth International Conference on Forensic Statistics. Tempe, Arizona, March 2005.
- Thompson, W.C. Assessing the Legal Relevance of Bullet Lead Evidence: Did the NRC Misfire? Presented at the Sixth International Conference on Forensic Statistics. Tempe, Arizona, March 2005.
- Thompson, W.C., Kromer, M. & Kaplan, P. Jurors' Evaluation of Contested DNA Evidence: A Case Study. Presented at the National Conference on Science and Law (National Institute of Justice), Miami Florida, October 2002.
- Thompson, W.C. What Wrongful Convictions Teach Us About Forensic Science. Presented at the bi-annual meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, Austin Texas, March 2002.
- Thompson, W.C. Recent Defense Challenges to Forensic DNA Evidence. Presented at the National Conference on Science and Law (National Institute of Justice), Miami Florida, October 2001.
- Thompson, W.C. Confirmation Bias in the Interpretation of Forensic DNA Evidence. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, August 2001.

RESEARCH GRANTS

- 2015-2020 Center for Statistical Analysis of Forensic Evidence (CSAFE). National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Center of Excellence Grant #426-17-02B, \$3,700,000 (Co-PI).
- 2014-18 NIJ Award #2014-DN-BX-K032: Developing effective methods for addressing contextual bias in forensic science. Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, \$355,705 (in collaboration with Dr. Michael Taylor, Institute for Environmental Science and Research, New Zealand), October 1, 2014-September 30, 2018.
- 2012-2015 Evidence, inference and bias in WMD forensics. University of California Lab Fees Research Program. Award ID# 12-LR-237268. Principal Investigator. (\$1,320,125).
- 2006-2009 Jurors' Evaluations of Forensic Science. National Science Foundation. Principal Investigator (\$125,000).
- 2006-2007 Assessing the Feasibility of Building a Database of Trial Transcripts Containing Scientific Testimony. The Project on Scientific Knowledge and Public Policy (SKAPP). Co-PI. (\$25,000).
- 2002-2003 Feasibility of a National Support Center on Scientific Evidence for Lawyers. Open Society Institute. (\$5000).

- 2002-2003 Evaluating the Feasibility of a National Support Center on Scientific Evidence for Criminal Lawyers. Newkirk Center for Science & Society. (\$16,000).
- 1999-2000 Developing Legal Research Skills Through Web-Based Tutorials. U.C. Irvine Division of Undergraduate Education. (\$5000).
- 1986-1990 Mathematical Evidence in Criminal Trials. National Science Foundation. Principal Investigator. (\$135,000).
- 1985-1986 Child Witnesses: A Research Proposal. U.C. Irvine Academic Senate Committee on Research -- Faculty Research Grant. Co-Principal Investigator (with Alison Clarke-Stewart). (\$4956).
- 1984-1985 Mathematical Evidence in Criminal Trials: Improving the Probability of Justice. U.C. Irvine Academic Senate Committee on Research -- Faculty Research Grant -- Principal Investigator. (\$15,000).

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AS AN ATTORNEY

- 2009 Drafted and filed an *Amici Curiae* brief with the United States Supreme Court (with Erin Murphy) on behalf of 20 scholars of forensic evidence in *McDaniel v. Brown*, 558 U.S. 120 (2010).
- 2001 Co-Counsel for defendant Cory Robinson, charged with murder with special circumstances in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Pasadena Branch. Responsible for cross-examination of prosecution DNA expert and direct examination of defense DNA expert. Trial resulted in hung jury, December 19, 2001.
- 1998-99 Court-Appointed Special Counsel for defendant John Cuff, in *U.S. v. Heatly, et al.* 37 F.Supp.2d 279 (S.D.N.Y. 1999). Prepared motions in a case raising novel statistical issues.
- 1995-96 Co-counsel for defendant in *People v. Marshall* (Superior Court of Los Angeles County, No. BA 069796)(Rape charges against defendant Sammy Marshall were dismissed after defense investigation uncovered error in lab's interpretation of autoradiograms).
- 1994-95 Co-counsel for O.J. Simpson in his criminal trial in Los Angeles. Responsible for law and motion work related to expert testimony on DNA evidence, including hearings on admissibility of mixture statistics, likelihood ratios and character attacks on experts. Second chair (to Barry Scheck and Peter Neufeld) during cross-examination of prosecution DNA experts and direct examination of defense DNA experts.
- 1989-94 Co-counsel for defendant in first New Mexico case involving forensic DNA evidence, *State v. Anderson*, 853 P.2d 135 (N.M.App. 1993)(FBI's statistical methods fail to meet Frye standard), rev'd under a different standard (Daubert), N.M. Sup.Ct. No. 21,069, Aug. 25, 1994. Served as lead counsel during 11-day pre-trial evidentiary hearing, prepared appellate briefs for New Mexico Court of Appeals and Supreme Court, argued case before New Mexico Supreme Court.

- 1991 Filed *Amicus* (Letter) Brief with California Supreme Court, arguing against review or depublication of *People v. Barney*, 8 Cal.App 4th 798 (1992).
- 1990 Co-counsel for defendant during pre-trial hearing on admissibility of forensic DNA evidence in *People v. Halik* (Superior Court of Los Angeles County, No. VA 000843, 1991), first case in California in which a defendant successfully challenged admissibility of RFLP analysis.

COURTROOM TESTIMONY AS AN EXPERT WITNESS

I have qualified as an expert and presented testimony on the following topics:

Social science methodology. Superior Court, San Diego County, California (Evidentiary hearing on a motion for severance of co-defendants in a capital trial), 1987; U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, 2000 (Testimony regarding statistical analyses in toxic waste case).

Jury selection procedures and social science research. District Court, Bernalillo County, Albuquerque, New Mexico, (Evidentiary hearing on a motion challenging jury selection procedures in a capital trial), 1988.

Survey research on scientific opinions. State court proceedings in Indiana, Texas, Minnesota, Arizona, Washington, Delaware and California, (Evidentiary hearings on admissibility of DNA tests under the Frye standard). 1988-89.

Forensic DNA testing, statistical interpretation of DNA test results. Federal District Court, Waco Texas (Hearing on inmate David Hicks' motion to reanalyze DNA evidence in a capital case), 1998. Los Angeles County Superior Court (testimony before jury in *People v. Dixon*), 1998. Coronial Court, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia (expert testimony concerning potential for laboratory errors and coincidental match probabilities in *Coroner's Inquest into Death of Jaidyn Leskie*), February 2004. Federal District Court, Amarillo, Texas (federal habeas hearing in *Skinner v. Watkins* on ineffective assistance of counsel), Nov. 2005; Orange County Superior Court (testimony before jury in *People v. Melton*), May 2014.

Scientific misconduct in crime laboratories. Presented invited testimony to two grand juries in Harris County (Houston) Texas concerning my observations and analysis of DNA testing errors in the Houston Police Department Crime Laboratory. June 2003.

PRESENTATIONS TO GOVERNMENTAL BODIES

National Commission on Forensic Science

--Results of a Survey of ASCLD Members (March 22, 2016).

--Invited presentation on contextual bias (August 27, 2014).

California Commission on the Fair Administration of Justice

--Invited testimony concerning role of forensic science in wrongful convictions (January 10, 2007)

California State Senate Committee on Public Safety

--Invited testimony concerning proposed legislation expanding DNA data banks (October, 1997).

California State Senate Select Committee on Genetics and Public Policy,
--Invited testimony concerning the status of forensic DNA evidence in criminal trials
(May 1996).

California Judicial Council.
--Invited testimony concerning proposed legislation limiting attorney voir dire in criminal
cases (November 1987).

ADVISORY BOARDS AND PANELS

Chair, Human Factors Committee, and member of Forensic Science Standards Board, Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC), National Advisory Committee on Human Factors in Forensic Science sponsored by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the U.S. Department of Justice. 2014-present.

Human Factors Subcommittee of the National Commission on Forensic Science.

Scientific Working Group for Forensic and Investigatory Speaker Recognition (SWG-Speaker). Advisory member of group sponsored jointly by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2013-present.

California Crime Laboratory Review Task Force. Appointed by California Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez. 2007-10.

American Bar Association Task Force on Biological Evidence. Member of Task Force that drafted the standards on DNA evidence that were adopted by the ABA in 2007. 2003-2006.

American Bar Association Standards Committee Study Group on DNA Evidence, Reporter for this group that examined evidentiary and procedural issues surrounding DNA evidence and the need for standards. 2000-2001.

National Forensic DNA Review Panel. Appointed as representative of the American Bar Association to this Panel charged with making recommendations to Congress regarding proficiency testing of forensic DNA laboratories. 1997-2001